



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,346	12/19/2003	Robert Falotico	CRD-5062 USANP	6421
27777 7590 08/04/2009 PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			EXAMINER HELM, CARALYNNE E	
			ART UNIT 1615	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/04/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/742,346	Applicant(s) FALOTICO ET AL.	
	Examiner CARALYNNE HELM	Art Unit 1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/3/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 3, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "potentinting" appears to be a misspelling of "potentiating" and line 14 of the claim has a string of articles that appear to be present in error ("elution rate of the and the rapamycin". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

Art Unit: 1615

in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although applicant points to figure 51 as giving basis for the amendment of “about 5 nano molar” and “about 40 nano molar” into instant claim 6, it is not clear that any of the tested data points depicted in figure 51 correspond to these concentrations and particularly 5 nanomolar and 40 nanomolar. These claimed values correspond to -8.3 and -7.4 on the Log [(Trichostatin A (M))] scale. None of the tested points in figure 51 correspond to the claimed values; therefore it is not clear that applicant contemplated the claimed concentrations at the time of the invention. Thus the recitations of “about 5 nano molar” and “about 40 nano molar” are new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The four factual inquiries of *Graham v. John Deere Co.* have been fully considered and analyzed in the rejections that follow.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tseng et al. (previously cited) in light of Windecker et al. (previously cited) and Roorda et al. (previously cited).

In claim 1, Tseng et al. teach a stent (an implantable structure), containing drug depots capable of controllably delivering one or more histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitors (see instant claims 6-7). In addition, Tseng et al. also teach that the disclosed device delivering the HDAC inhibitors is particularly beneficial in the treatment of restenosis, implying that the HDAC inhibitors would be present at therapeutic dosages within the stent device (see paragraph 37; instant claim 6). Tseng et al. go on to further describe the HDAC inhibitor included on or in the stent body as trichostatin A, abbreviated as TSA (see claims 12-14 and paragraph 15 lines 1-2; instant claim 9). Tseng et al. teach the effectiveness of TSA at 50 nano molar in the inhibition of smooth

muscle cell proliferation (see paragraph 168; instant claim 6). Since applicant has provided no means by which to determine how much variation is allowed by the term "about", 50 nanomolar is interpreted as "about 40 nanomolar" (see instant claim 6). Also taught by Tseng et al. is the inclusion of an additional pharmaceutical agent or agents, such as anti-inflammatory and anti-proliferative agents, where an exemplary agent includes rapamycin (see paragraph 134 lines 1-4 and 12-13 and claims 2 and 3; instant claim 6). Further, Tseng et al. teach that the drug depots include one or more polymers (see claim 6). Tseng et al. does not specifically teach rapamycin as the preferred additional pharmaceutical or specifically describe the polymer-drug configuration as a coating on the stent device.

Windecker et al. teach that rapamycin (also known as sirolimus) has powerful anti-proliferative and anti-migratory drug properties on vascular smooth muscle cells (see page 1089 column 1 paragraph 1 lines 1-5; instant claim 10). In addition, Windecker et al. go on to teach that its incorporation into biocompatible polymers, suitable for stent based drug delivery, has been successful (see page 1089 column 1 paragraph 1 lines 5-7; instant claim 10).

Roorda et al. teach a drug eluting stent with drug-polymer base layer and an additional polymer topcoat (see paragraph 12 lines 1-4; instant claim 6). Roorda et al. go on to teach that the topcoat serves as a rate limiting membrane to control the release of drug from the device (see paragraph 12 lines 8-11; instant claim 6). Roorda et al. teach that these coating layers are composed of polymers and that both polyacrylates alone and in conjunction with fluorinated polymers are considered suitable varieties (see

Art Unit: 1615

paragraph 28 and 29 lines 1-3; instant claim 6). Further, Roorda et al. teach a configuration where poly(n-butyl methacrylate) is used as a topcoat and in a blend with another polymer in the drug containing layer (see paragraph 29 and example 18). One such other polymer is taught to be a fluorinated polymer, namely poly(vinylidene fluoride-co-hexafluoro propene) (see paragraph 28). This copolymer is exemplified in use as a coating on the device where the proportion of vinylidene fluoride to hexafluoro propene is 85:15 (see example 12). Differing polymer properties and associated drug release kinetics are achieved as the proportion of the monomer in the polymer backbone of the coating is varied. Various amounts of poly(n-butyl methacrylate) are taught to be included in the topcoat including 200 μg and 300 μg . Since the amount of polymer present in the topcoat has a controlling effect on the rate of release of the contained drug, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize this quantity to achieve particularly desired release kinetics. The reference does not teach the particular claimed vinylidene fluoride to hexafluoro propene ratio in the copolymer or amount of poly(n-butylmethacrylate) present in the topcoat. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation and achieve the claimed values.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to couple the device of Tseng et al. with the teachings of Windecker et al. to produce a stent (an implantable medical device) containing drug depots capable of controllably releasing therapeutic dosages of trichostatin A and rapamycin, an anti-

Art Unit: 1615

proliferative. In addition, since both Roorda and Tseng et al. teach stents with polymeric matrices that provide for controllable release of a combination of drugs to address restenosis, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to utilize the particular polymers and layer configuration as taught by Roorda et al. in the invention of Tseng et al. in view of Windecker et al. Applicant teaches in the instant specification that any combination of fluoropolymer and acrylics would produce incompatible polymer chemistry, therefore the described coating formulations of Roorda et al. would have the claimed characteristic of immiscibility (see instant specification page 127 lines 11-15 and claim 6). Since all three inventions address the issue of the body's response to medical device implantation (drug eluting stents) one skilled in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success for the combination. Furthermore, applicant teaches that the sheer presence of rapamycin (sirolimus) with trichostatin A may potentiate each other's anti-restenotic activity (see instant specification page 9 lines 21-25). According to MPEP 2112.01, "A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present." This treatment results from *In re Spada*, which states that, "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties." *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Since Tseng et al. in view of Windecker et al. and Roorda et al. make obvious the claimed device with trichostatin A and rapamycin present in combination, it also would have this

potentiation effect between the two actives. Thus, claims 6-7 are obvious over Tseng et al. in view of Windecker et al. and Roorda et al.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tseng et al. in light of Windecker et al. and Roorda et al. as applied to claims 6 and 7 above, and further in view of Carter et al. (previously cited).

As previously described Tseng et al. modified by both Windecker et al. and Roorda et al. teach a stent device with drug depots containing trichostatin A and rapamycin, where the claimed drugs at the claimed concentration are contained within a polymeric basecoat and are able to be controllably released in therapeutic dosages, and further contains a polymeric topcoat that controls the drug elution and whose polymer is immiscible with that of the basecoat (see above). The modified Tseng et al. reference also teaches that the reason for incorporating the trichostatin A within the stent device is for dealing with the issue of restenosis following stent implantation (see Tseng et al. paragraphs 29, 31, and 37). Tseng et al. modified by Windecker et al. and Roorda et al. does not specifically teach stent grafts containing the drug depots with controllable release capabilities.

Carter et al. teach that stents are commonly used to clear obstructions and to repair damage to vascular tissue (see paragraph 39 lines 2-5). Carter et al. go on to teach that stent grafts are a common name for a modification of stents where a flexible covering is attached to the stent frame (see paragraph 39 lines 10-12) and that the implantation process for stents, as a whole, carries with it the risk of causing restenosis

(see paragraph 50 line 9). Since stent grafts are a modification of stents and also subject to post-implantation restenosis, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the invention of Tseng et al. in light of Windecker et al. and Roorda et al., by incorporating the controllably releasing drug depots, configured as a bilayered polymeric coating containing trichostatin A at about 40 nano molar and rapamycin, within a stent-graft device. Therefore, instant claims 6 and 8 are obvious over Tseng et al. in light of Windecker et al., Roorda et al., and Carter et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments, filed April 3, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant notes that Tseng et al. teach a trichostatin A concentration of 50 nanomolar but argues that this does not correspond to a range of about 5 to 40 nanomolar. Claim 6 actually recites that the trichostatin A is in the range of about 5 nanomolar to about 40 nanomolar. Since no requisite degree was established for the term "about" it is reasonable to interpret 50 to correspond to about 40. Therefore Tseng et al. do indeed teach trichostatin A in the range of about 5 nanomolar and about 40 nanomolar as instantly claimed.

Applicant further argues that there was no motivation to combine the cited references. Each of the references discuss drug eluting endovascular devices that address stenosis and restenosis. Thus as references in the same field of endeavor that

specifically address the same issue via a similar approach, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the combinations cited.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The rejections and/or objections detailed above are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARALYNNE HELM whose telephone number is (571)270-3506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8-5 (EDT).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1615

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Caralynne Helm/
Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/Tracy Vivlemore/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635